

LIBRARY

JUN 28 1989

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE
FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
CANADIAN MISCELLANY;

OR, THE

Religious, Literary & Statistical Intelligencer.

No. II.]

MAY, 1828.

[VOL. I.

ON THE STATE AND PROSPECTS OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
IN THE CANADAS.

THERE is no single object of such vast importance to a community—none in which its great and permanent interests are so deeply involved, as education. On this depends the improvement, intellectual and moral, of the minds of the people—and what improvement can be compared with this, either in its immediate or remote effects! The general prosperity and happiness of a community, are most effectually secured, when due provision is made for training up the youth by the generous discipline of a manly and enlightened education. If we take a general survey of the nations of the world, we shall find that their rank in the political scale, corresponds invariably with the degree in which knowledge is diffused, and the blessings of education extended to the population. A well educated nation, however barren its soil, or ungenial its climate—however inconsiderable the extent of its territory, or the number of its inhabitants, will always evince and confirm the truth of the famous maxim of Lord Bacon, that “knowledge is power.” Witness Scotland, which has risen mainly, we are persuaded, in consequence of the superior excellence of the national system of education, to a rank in the scale of nations, which the proudest and mightiest States might well envy. Nor have the inestimable benefits of a manly and virtuous education conferred upon her people, been circumscribed within the narrow limits of her own territory—of the British Islands, or even the wide extent of the British Empire. She affords glorious evidence that the power of education is not more beneficent than it is diffusive. What region of the earth, accessible to man, or opening any field for adventure or enterprise, have her sons not visited, imparting to it the blessings of civilisation and improvement, carrying, wherever they go, the invaluable gifts of art, knowledge, science and religion. It were much to be wished that some person qualified for such an interesting inquiry, would undertake the task of unfolding a view of the influence which Scotland, intellectually and morally, has exerted on the rest of the world, and the degree in which her power in

these respects, may yet be extended and made subservient to the advancement of the Empire and glory of Britain. Such an inquiry, we are persuaded, would exhibit results of which even few Scotsmen are fully aware. What a fine comment would it furnish on the celebrated axiom above quoted. How strikingly would it evince to all unprejudiced men the vast power of education, by shewing that one small nation, which has not been favoured by nature, either in her soil or climate, has been to the rest of the world more than any other of the British nations, "the little Leaven that leaveneth the whole Lump."

Of what moment, therefore, must it be to a young and rising country, to secure the unspeakable advantage of a liberal and effective system of education. It is beyond comparison, the first and most important object of legislative attention. To make provision for giving it to the people on the cheapest and easiest terms, without any restriction or shackles imposed that are not absolutely necessary for the safety of the state, and the protection of religion and morality, is, we conceive, the first and most sacred duty of every legislature or government,—nor can a greater reproach be attached to the rulers of a nation, in as much as there cannot be any neglect of their high trust, more fatal or more difficult to be remedied, than that of education. Without a due attention to this most vital interest of the State in the first instance, all other legislation will be vain and impotent. "*Quid vance proficiunt leges, sine moribus.*" Education, co-operating with habit and example, is the great former of individual character; and therefore it is evident that ultimately it must fashion and determine the spirit and the character of nations. An enlightened education is the corrector of errors and prejudices, the parent of all right opinions, of all sound principles, the very fountain of truth and virtue. It is the former and enlightener of that public opinion which is above the "sceptered sway;" and while it is the just object of terror to all arbitrary power, to all dominion and influence not founded on right and administered with justice and beneficence; it is the true basis and the sure guardian of the throne that is "established in righteousness." It may be truly regarded as the palladium of a free state, the ark of rational liberty, and will avail more for protecting and securing all rights public and private, than even a free press; for, without education, a free press could do nothing, even supposing, what is scarcely conceivable, that it could exist in such circumstances. In fine, it is scarcely hyperbolic to say, that it is a panacea or universal remedy for almost all the distempers and derangements which can affect or assail the body politic.

But while it is thus omnipotent for good, it is scarcely less so for evil. It may become a powerful engine in the hands of a party or a faction, and be perverted to the worst and most dangerous purposes, to the destruction of civil and religious liberty, to the support of

bigotry, superstition and arbitrary power. It is like the lever of Archimedes; the party which can grasp and wield it, if—(which we fear is rare and almost unexampled in the history of the world)—their virtue, patriotism and love of liberty, do not get the better of their ambition and party feelings, may, and at the long run, inevitably will lay prostrate all opposition, and mould to their views and interests, the whole community. The very foundations of truth and liberty are sapped and subverted when this potent engine is usurped and engrossed by the ambitious, the bigotted, or by designing men, whatever may be their party and views. What a melancholy example of the malignant and fatal power of a perverted education with regard to the genius, learning, religion, and liberties of a people, does the present condition of Spain, Italy and Portugal exhibit, and what a lesson do they impress on the minds of the statesman and legislator, of the patriot and the philosopher. It is true, these are examples of its most extreme abuse, but they suggest a warning which observation and experience will amply confirm, that whatever, in any degree, tends not only to pervert and corrupt the spirit of national education, but even to contract its power, and to diminish its influence and efficacy, is an evil of the greatest magnitude. In every country, therefore, which is qualified to appreciate and not unworthy to enjoy the blessings of freedom and education, the legislature will not only provide means for its support on an adequate scale, but will watch with the most jealous vigilance and circumspection over the administration of its funds and institutions, and adopt every possible precaution against all usurpation or intrusion on the part of those who may have any temptation to enlist its agency in their own cause. As nature, by her universal and perfect laws, has communicated and diffused alike to every part of the creation, the indispensable blessing of air and light, so the supreme power in every state should provide that education not only be not intercepted from any, even the humblest member of the community, but that it be communicated to all in the fullest extent of its advantages. It should, as much as may be, preclude all possibility of any individual, of any faction or body, narrowing, intercepting or perverting, in any measure, this most needful and beneficent provision for the intellectual, moral and political life, health, soundness and vigour of the social system.

The principle now universally admitted after a long and violent opposition, that the diffusion of knowledge is a blessing to society, and that therefore it becomes a political as well as a moral and religious duty to promote education, we regard as one of the greatest triumphs which truth has gained in our day, indeed, we might have said, in any period of the world. But, notwithstanding this triumph, we must not flatter ourselves that the cause of education is not exposed to some danger still, from the selfish machinations of designing and ambitious men. However they may have been compelled to abandon their old ground, and to renounce, if not

the spirit, at least the appearance and profession of hostility to its cause, they are too deeply impressed with a sense of its mighty power, as an engine of party, not to endeavour, by all arts, to draw it entirely into their own hands, and to wield and exert it for their own purposes. They have not changed their spirit or their principles, but merely their language and mode of reasoning. Though they may not openly avow it, they have the same end still in view, but they pursue it by a new path. They have not abandoned the field, but merely shifted their ground, and changed their mode of attack. Those who formerly looked, or had they lived half a century earlier, would have looked, as we shrewdly conjecture, with aspect malign on the progress of popular education, and on all who were in earnest to promote it, are now either persuaded or shamed into an abjuration of this obsolete heresy. But still they are ill at ease on this subject. They seem to forget that if education is free and unfettered, its progress is the progress of knowledge, and therefore of truth, and can never do hurt to any party, to any system, of which the spirit and tendency are in harmony with truth. Or if they do not forget this, they at least betray a consciousness that they cannot safely trust their cause to the strength of its own merits, or suffer education to operate with its free, full and uninfected influence.

Accordingly, they now contend that though it is the duty of the state to promote education, it is bound to place its administration exclusively in the hands of certain bodies, and to incorporate with it certain principles political and ecclesiastical. They assume a principle or axiom, the truth of which must be admitted, but reason from it after a fashion not uncommon with them, according to which, almost any conclusion may be deduced from any premises. Religion, say they, and we most cordially assent to the proposition, ought to form a main object of attention in the education of youth. But we deny absolutely the conclusion attempted to be drawn, that a certain establishment, or particular body or order of men in the community, be exclusively invested with the government of seminaries of education, and the instruction of youth. From the proposition that religion ought to form a prominent part of education, it can never be deduced on any principles of legitimate reasoning, that the whole management and controul of it should be vested in the hands of the Clergy of a particular Church. But this, so far as we are able to discover, is the purport and amount of Dr. Strachan's reasoning in favour of the exclusive character of the University, for the erection of which, he has lately obtained a charter from his Majesty. Does the Doctor seriously believe that languages, science, and philosophy cannot or ought not to be taught without engrafting upon them the theology or politics of some religious establishment? Is there not a time and a place for every thing? Would it not produce utter confusion and perplexity of ideas to the professor and to the pupils, to jumble together things so remote and heterogeneous as

Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, and the Ecclesiastical Polity or Theological Peculiarities of a certain Church? If this is not implied in the Doctor's argument—if it merely imports that the professor ought to have a general sense of Religion, to be a believer in the Gospel, and to inculcate and enforce wherever it is natural or seasonable in the course of his instructions, sound principles, moral and religious, on his pupils, we readily concur in the truth of the position, but cannot perceive what connection it has with the conclusion which it is brought to support, namely, the vesting of the exclusive controul of education in some one Church or Ecclesiastical Body. We readily admit that the Professor should not be a Deist, much less an Atheist; we think he ought to be a Christian in the strictest sense of the word, one heartily attached to Religion, and in earnest to patronise and promote its faith and influence among his pupils, so far as it may, without any violence, or any departure from his appropriate functions, be in his power so to do. But while we admit all this, we do think it would be altogether from the purpose of his office and the nature of his duties, to become *ex-cathedra*, the advocate of any particular set of doctrines or form of worship, or to endeavour directly or indirectly, to make impressions on the minds of his pupils in favour of any Church, or in any manner or degree to set himself to prepossess the minds of the youth under his charge, for or against any system of Religious Faith, in a College which was professedly open to pupils of all denominations. And if it were in such circumstances unwarrantable and inconsistent with the design and constitution of the University to tamper with the religious faith and principles of the youth who might attend it, we would be glad to be informed what necessity demands, or what utility recommends, the exclusion of loyal, learned and able men of whatever sect or party, who are firm believers in the truth of the Christian Religion.

The youth ought to be instructed in the peculiar doctrines of their respective Communion, by their Pastors; any attempt to interfere more or less, with their religious principles, would, as we conceive, be inconsistent with the spirit of the Charter: a University or a College, erected wholly or even principally for the purpose of proselytising, we hesitate not to say, would be an enormous evil, an intolerable nuisance; and we are struck with equal astonishment at the folly and the assurance of the man who avows and publishes broadly to the world, a project so monstrously ridiculous! If any one reads the speech of Dr. Strachan, and is unacquainted with the sentiments and views which he has revealed, perhaps with more frankness than discretion, in his various other publications, he may, peradventure, be deceived into the charitable supposition, that the only view of that venerable personage in framing the charter, was to protect the Christian Faith, and to guard against infidelity and irreligion, and that he, simple hearted generous man! was grieved in spirit, when his utmost exertions in favour of a liberal constitution, could only avert the

yoke from the necks of the Students, but not prevent its imposition on the Members of the Council.—What will be the surprise of such persons when they learn that the Doctor has elsewhere avowed and published to all the world that, for half a century to come, the business of proselytising will afford a sufficient occupation for the academical body over which he presides. Philosophy and learning will be meanwhile laid on the shelf to sleep in peace, until this religious renovation is accomplished, and doubtless will awake from their long slumber with a youthful vigour and renovation in the year of Jubilee.—But, to resume our subject, the Doctor's plot is an excellent plot, and has the merit of being perfectly intelligible, even to the shallowest. Open wide the portals of the University—admit all the youth—invite and encourage them to come in—come in, but how return—how come out?—Proselytes to the true Faith. The raw uninstructed youth under the discipline of this proselytising College, very appropriately placed under the direction of a president, who is himself an illustrious proselyte, will have their minds industriously imbued with the principles of his adopted Church, and to Episcopalise *Secretarians* and *Dissenters*, will employ the wisdom and the zeal of this learned body—while the ostensible and professed object of their Establishment—the care and the culture of Literature, Science and Philosophy are to be suspended for half a century—a period declared to be not more than sufficient for the completion of the great and good work.

“But in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird.” The people of Upper Canada, who are not of the Communion of the Church of England, will have only two alternatives presented to them, either to deprive their children of a University Education, or to send them to King's College, with the hazard, if not the certainty, of having their religious Faith and Principles shaken or subverted. Rather than incur this danger, they may be inclined to send them to a College in the United States, deeming the peril of political Heresy, less formidable than, as it may be viewed by them, *a religious perversion*.

The people of Upper Canada, who are not of the Episcopal Communion, will, we presume, be disposed to regard the Doctor's University with jealousy and fear, and to say of it as the Fox did when he excused himself for not having paid a visit to the Lion's den with the other animals, who dutifully went to congratulate their monarch on his recovery from a fit of sickness—“I see all the footsteps pointing towards your den—none from it.”

We have long beheld with regret, and not without some alarm for the ultimate consequences, symptoms by no means ambiguous or disguised, of a disposition on the part of those who are now vested, almost exclusively with the superintendence and management, or who, at least, exert a paramount influence and controul over the funds and institutions for Education in both Provinces, to make them subservient to their party views.

This we regard as an evil of no ordinary magnitude, and if it be not speedily and effectually remedied, it will assuredly be productive of much excitement and discontent. However painful, it has now become the unavoidable duty of those who have been with the most palpable injustice excluded from all share in the direction of education, to disabuse his Majesty's Government on this very important subject, and most respectfully, but earnestly, to solicit the redress of those grievances under which they have hitherto laboured, in consequence, as they firmly believe, of misrepresentation and intrigue. When we consider that the population of these Provinces is made up of almost all the denominations of the Christian world—that the great majority are Catholics—that the remaining population is composed, not only of different religious persuasions, but of different nations, Scotch, Irish, American and English, and that the Episcopal Communion embraces but a very small proportion of the mixed population, it would seem incredible that such exorbitant pretensions should be avowed, or that they should even have been conceived.

Such pretensions are utterly at variance with all maxims of sound policy, and we cannot but add, of common sense. They are wild and impracticable. They will not, they cannot succeed in such a country as this; and the only effect of urging them, must be to discredit and weaken the Church of England, to excite opposition, disaffection and disgust, and thereby to render their ultimate failure more certain and complete. The advancing of claims so antiquated and obsolete, so repugnant to the spirit of the age in which we live, and so incompatible with the interests and the feelings of this country, seems to reverse the comparison of our Saviour—it is attempting to sew a piece of *old* cloth on a *new* garment, which will inevitably be rent in pieces by the strength and the straining of that to which it is applied. But the advocates for introducing into Canada, the exclusive system with regard to Religion and Education, very prudently forbear from arguing the principle on general grounds of reason or expediency; and in order, as it would seem, to hide the weakness of their cause, and to find some shelter and defence against the assault which they cannot meet directly, they appeal to the Religious and Literary Establishments of Great Britain, and are fain to fight behind the walls and battlements of those venerable and time-hallowed Institutions.—And if we could give them credit for a true sympathy with whatever is valuable and venerable in these noble establishments, we would regard them and their projects with much less distrust and jealousy than we can, with our present sentiments, afford to do. We are so uncharitable as to think that they have set their eye and their heart more on the blemishes than the beauties, more on the defects and imperfections, than the real excellencies which are to be found in these Establishments. We think, to adopt the characteristic expression of Miss Edgeworth's Scotsman, that "it may be doubted" whether the gentleman of whom we speak,

sympathise with as lively sincerity with all that these great Institutions bear in their character and design, that is in unison with the liberal wisdom of Bacon and of Locke, as we shrewdly suspect they do with certain relics of Monkish superstition and gothic ignorance.

Now, were we even to admit that the Establishments of Great Britain, Academical and Ecclesiastical, were incapable of any amelioration, and that viewed in relation to the circumstances of the Parent Country, they were absolutely perfect—while we see them gradually, and in some late instances, very rapidly divesting themselves of ancient prejudices, and rubbing off industriously the rust of ages—while we see them wisely availing themselves of the lights of time and experience, nay, adopting the boldest and most decisive measures for the correction of errors and abuses, and the introduction of new and better principles and methods*—waving all this, we might still ask, are these Establishments to be imitated without any reserve or exception—are they to be applied without any qualification or change to a country, in many respects, very differently circumstanced? If the British Parliament had to devise a new system, Academical or Ecclesiastical, is it perfectly certain that they would resume, without any modification, the old model or pattern framed in times of ignorance, when political philosophy was in its infancy, or at least, in times destitute of many of the lights of enlarged knowledge and experience which we now happily enjoy? The practice of reasoning in this confident and unqualified manner, from the Institutions, whether Academical, Religious, or Political, of the Parent Country, is not, we apprehend, quite so legitimate and trustworthy as it is common. Change of place and of time, almost invariably demands a corresponding change in policy.

But we will not rest the cause on a rejection, *as inapplicable to the case*, of the precedents and examples which Dr. Strachan, we fear, somewhat rashly and imprudently has pleaded in favour of his exclusive system. He has appealed to the Constitution of the Church of Scotland, and of her Universities, as an authority in his favour. This may be regarded, so far as we are concerned, as a sort of argumentum ad hominem, and we shall therefore be somewhat particular in answering it. We will, in the first place, therefore, beg leave to differ altogether from the venerable Archeacon in his assumption, which is indeed a very sweeping one, that to the exclusive principle in question, Scotland owes the worth, piety and learning of her Sons—for we are bold to aver that it is not merely because Scotland has an established Church, and Universities, Schools, &c., under the superintendence

* On this very interesting subject, we beg permission to recommend to the attention of Dr. Strachan, and those who favour his views, a very masterly article in the Quarterly Review, No. 71, in which the Reviewer has compared, and indeed contrasted, the system of the English Universities, with that of the Scotch.—This article is remarkable also, as affording a striking example of the rapid progress of enlightened and liberal opinions in the Parent Country, of which any reader may satisfy himself, by comparing this with other articles on the same subject, in the preceding numbers of the work.

and controul of that Church, with tests, subscriptions, &c., that she has risen to her present eminence, moral and literary—but it is because her Establishments are in spirit and in practice liberal, tolerant and mild—it is because their exclusiveness is scarcely perceptible, scarcely felt—it is because the good sense, intelligence and liberality of the people of Scotland, have in effect exploded these “*prisci vertigia ruris*,” and would be inclined to laugh to scorn this plea which the Doctor has built on the Constitution of her Church and Universities, with no other view than to bolster up a system in most palpable and extreme repugnance to their character and spirit; and with an ingenuity which we cannot but admire, while he applauds their excellence and efficiency, ascribes it wholly to a principle by which he would proscribe her children, in a British Colony, from having any place or portion in the establishments of the Country—and stigmatise them as not worthy to be entrusted with an equal measure of power, privilege and influence with the Sister Establishment.

The Doctor, we perceive, is but little acquainted with the actual state and practice of our Scottish Universities, and still less with their spirit. We do not know that he could have adduced another example more fatal to his cause. For while, in Scotland, the vast majority of the people are attached to the established Church, and the vast majority of the Dissenters are now scarcely to be distinguished from the Members of the Establishment, it is a fact, that there are no tests, and so lightly does the power of the Church, in regard to the exacting of subscriptions to her Creed, bear on our Episcopal Brethren who, let it be particularly noted, are, as soon as they plant a foot on the north side of the Tweed, really and absolutely Dissenters—that, in the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, there are and have been not a few professors of that persuasion, who, it is perfectly understood, continue to adhere to their own creed, enjoy a most perfect toleration, and go without any let or impediment to their own chapels—nay, are accustomed to give to their classes holidays on certain of the grand Festivals of their Church, while, meantime, the Presbyterian professors attend their classes, and the general business of the College goes on as usual. Such is the practical liberality of the Scottish Universities, and it affords a most decisive and satisfactory answer to those who allege that harmony and unity of sentiment could not be maintained in an academical senate or council composed of professors differing in religious faith and sentiments. As it is not one of the objects contemplated in the constitution of our Scottish Universities to make converts to Presbytery, there is no more peril of any discord or collision, in consequence of any difference in religious faith, in our College senates, when the interests of education and literature are brought under deliberation, than in any committee of merchants or bank directors similarly composed, who never dream of allowing religious and ecclesiastical questions to be mixed up with the

proper business of their respective boards. Of one thing we feel confident, that out of Spain, Portugal or Italy the Doctor would not find a single specimen of an academical establishment to match his proselytising University; and, indeed, such is the spirit of *liberalism* that has now spread abroad, at least through all the Protestant parts of Europe, that we are persuaded they would receive with incredulity or laughter the tidings that a venerable Archdeacon of the Church of England had erected a University in the metropolis of a British Province in North America, for the sole purpose of converting—not the Aborigines to the Christian Faith, not the Catholics to the doctrines of the Reformed Churches—but of bringing over to the communion of his adopted Church the members of the Sister Establishment, to which he himself continued to be attached for a considerable period of his life—and that large sums of money and extensive tracts of land were appropriated, under the same auspices, for this pious and charitable purpose.—But, to resume the subject of our Scottish Universities, we congratulate ourselves and the country on the Doctor's approval of their system; and if he will only take the trouble, in the first place, to inform himself of their true character and actual practice, and frame his College with an enlightened liberality and a just discrimination of local circumstances, with more regard to the spirit than to the letter of his patterns, we could have little doubt that the result would be as honourable to himself as it would be satisfactory and beneficial to the Country. As the vast majority of the population of Canada are not of the communion of the Church of England, and as the members of the Scottish Church, notwithstanding all letters, charts, pamphlets and circulars to the contrary, we are bold to affirm, do greatly outnumber her *bonà fide* adherents, even after all that the zeal of proselytizing has achieved in times past, let the Doctor be counselled to give up his exclusive system, if not on the score of its illiberality, at least of its impracticability; but, at all events, if he would hide from himself and others its weakness and its deformity, let him not bring it into comparison with our Scottish Universities, for this is to aggravate by contrast its illiberality.—We can assure the Doctor that the religious character of the people of Scotland, so far as we have been able to discover, is not owing chiefly, or even in any considerable degree, to the discipline of our public Schools and Universities, or to the attention paid to it in them; we have, indeed, known some of our youth forget their religious knowledge, and abandon their religious principles there—and with all due respect for the religious character of our Schools and Universities, in which view we doubt not, as in every other, they will be found second to no other Seminaries in the world, we do not give them the credit of producing the religious character of the people. No—we believe that Scotland owes this, much more to the universal and religious observance of the Sabbath day, to the regular attendance of all the people on the services of the Church and the ordinances of Religion, and above all to her domestic discipline,

the pious care of parents and heads of families ; she owes it primarily to the *Church in the house*. If we are asked what has produced and diffused this religious character, which, however it may tend to preserve and to perpetuate itself, must have been formed by influences and institutions, external and independent of itself, we would reply, that it seems to us that the primary and grand agency by which this character has been formed, may be traced to the constitution and discipline of our national Church, which is admirably calculated to promote and secure the respectability and usefulness of the Clergy—whom it strictly precludes from all secular offices—prohibits their holding pluralities, obliges all of them to preach and to go through all the duties and labours of the pastoral office, so long as they hold any living in the Church ; and while it secures most effectually their temporal provision, has, by establishing the parity of all her Clergy, and forbidding any one to hold more than a single cure, cut off all the temptations that wealth, ambition and the prospect of rising through a long succession of dignities and promotions, present to try the virtue and the self-denial of the Clergy of some other Churches : in short, instead of dazzling her ministers by a display of outward splendour, and intoxicating them with a love of ecclesiastical promotion and advancement, she has taken every possible security that they may have no temptation to forget the simplicity, humility and laborious zeal which alone can form an Apostolical Church or Clergy, and has left them, in fact, no other sources whence to acquire reputation, honour and dignity, than learning, piety and worth.

To all this it may be added that the enlightened and liberal character of her institutions, academical and ecclesiastical, have given to the whole of her population, to the Dissenters, in as large a measure, (certainly with as ample an improvement on their part) as to the immediate members of the Church, all the freedom of conscience and of worship, all the blessings of learning and education, and a competition on almost equal terms with the establishment itself.

The great and happy effects which have resulted from the liberal Constitution, and still more liberal administration of her Establishments for the support of Religion and Learning, are universally known ; and we are persuaded that all impartial men who inquire into the causes of that pre-eminence to which Scotland has risen, in the past and present century, in knowledge, learning, piety and moral worth, will agree with us in ascribing it to the manly and enlightened principles which guided our reformers in framing our public institutions, and which, through their operation and influence, have imparted to the national character and spirit, that good sense and liberal tone by which it is distinguished ; and which, like a vital influence, has preserved their healthy and vigorous action, and provided for their progressive expansion and improvement.

We cannot forbear to remark in the present instance, that it seems somewhat inconsistent and ungracious, that in a College established

by the suggestion, and under the auspices of a Scotsman, who received his education, and is indebted for his learning and usefulness to the Institutions of his native land, the charter should be so framed as to exclude from official dignity and emolument, the honest and attached Members of our Church. Surely the Doctor must have felt himself strongly impelled by the feelings of gratitude, as well as by the pride and the spirit of a Scotsman, to protest against a proscription so illiberal, ungenerous, impolitic, and unjust. What, would you exclude, might he have said indignantly, to those illiberal and bigotted persons, whoever they may have been, who thwarted and counteracted his enlightened and generous views with regard to the Constitution of the University—would you exclude in a British Colony, the natives of the Sister Kingdom from an equal participation in all the rights, privileges and honours of British subjects—of the natives of the Colony? This, under any circumstances, would be palpable and flagrant injustice. But, in the present case, the grievance is peculiarly aggravated, for it affects a people to whom, of all others, the British Colonies are most peculiarly and deeply indebted, and none of her Colonies more remarkably than the Canadas. To omit all consideration of any part which Scottish valour and spirit bore in the acquisition of this Country to the Empire, it is a fact, notorious to all the world, that the natives of Scotland, chiefly in consequence of their intelligence, learning, and good morals, have contributed, in the most signal manner, to extend, to establish, and to perpetuate the power, the influence, and all that is most excellent and valuable in the character of their Country and her Institutions, as well in Canada, as in the other dominions of Great Britain. They form a most numerous portion of the whole population, perhaps inferior only to the natives who are of French extraction, and if we take into account their intelligence, wealth, learning and consideration, they are, without all question, the most important and respectable part of the British population. Without them, and without the manly spirit of intelligence and enterprise which they carry with them into every part of the world, what would the Colonies of Britain have been at the present day? Our Legislative and Executive Councils are filled with them—our wealthiest merchants, our most substantial and prosperous agriculturalists, our most sober, industrious and well-doing settlers, are Scotsmen; nay, many of the most extensive, populous, flourishing and, we must add, loyal settlements, are purely, or by a vast majority, Scottish. But this is not all. To Scotsmen education in this Colony, owes every thing. Its very Patriarchs and Apostles in Canada, of whom the Doctor might have claimed to himself the well merited honour of being the first in point of time, if not in point of merit, have been almost exclusively Scotch. We might challenge the Country to produce, at this day, any individual of conspicuous merit, who, if he received his education in this Country, did not owe, at least

the most important part of that invaluable acquisition to a Scottish Preceptor, or to some learned disciple of some learned adventurer from that land of learning? We could almost fancy that we see the Doctor under the warm inspiration of his Scottish feelings rising into a strain of indignant eloquence, and demanding, in all the “preferved spirit” of his country, of those who would stigmatize her and her sons, by a proscription so basely ungrateful to their merit and their services to the Empire—what would be the consequence of this exclusion? If you shut the door of honourable preferment in your Colonies, against the natives of Scotland, you will inflict a cruel wrong on a most meritorious people, as well as a serious calamity on your Empire. What, (might he have demanded,) would be the condition of your Colonies, if ye were to debar from them, the knowledge, the spirit, the talents, the virtues of the people of Scotland? This would be to strike out the very eye and soul of your foreign dominions; for to Scotland, at least hitherto, they have been almost exclusively indebted for the light of knowledge and learning. To your foreign Empire, Scotland has been the one eye of the Cyclops—deprive it of this organ of intellectual light, and where will ye find the means of replacing or repairing it. It may be wise to consider, ere it be too late, whether there would not be some hazard that the foreign and distant dominions of Great Britain might suggest to our minds, a comparison with the fate of the blind Polyphemus, “*Monstrum, horrendum, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.*”

(To be continued.)

THE SCOTCH CHURCH.

The following striking and eloquent picture of our national Church and Schools, is from a sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, at the opening of the new Caledonian Church, London. The Sermon is “On the Respect due to Antiquity”—from Jeremiah 6th and 16th:—

“Knox was the chief compiler of the first book of Discipline, and to him we owe our present system of parochial education. By that scheme of Ecclesiastical polity, a School was required for every Parish, and had all its views been followed up, a College would have been erected in every notable town. On this inestimable service done to Scotland, we surely do not need to expatiate. The very mention of it lights up an instant and enthusiastic approval in every bosom. And with all the veneration that is due on other grounds to our reformer, we hold it among the proudest glories of his name,

that it stands associated with an Institution which has spread abroad the light of a most beautiful moral decoration throughout all the hamlets of our land, and is dear to every Scottish heart, as are the piety and the worth of its peasant families."

* * * * * * * * *

" In conclusion, let me now address you as members of the Church of Scotland, which, in principle, is essentially Protestant; and which, though like other Churches it has its articles and its formularies of doctrine, yet wants no such discipleship as that which is grounded on blind submission to her authority, but only the discipleship of those who, in the free exercise of their judgement and their conscience, honestly believe her doctrine to be grounded on the authority of the word of God. Both her Catechism and Confession of Faith have been given to the public with note and comment it is true, but with note and comment that consist exclusively of Bible texts; and so, like apples of gold in pictures of silver, they offer a list of dogmata, but of dogmata set, as it were, or embossed in Scripture. The natural depravity of man; his need both of a regeneration and of an atonement: the accomplishment of the one by the efficacy of a divine sacrifice, and of the other by the operation of a sanctifying spirit; the doctrine that a sinner is justified by faith, followed up, most earnestly and incessantly followed up, through the pulpits of our land, by the doctrine that he is judged by works; the righteousness of Christ as the alone foundation of his meritorious claim to heaven, but this followed up by his own personal righteousness, as the indispensable preparation for heaven's exercises and heaven's joys; the free offer of pardon even to the chief of sinners, but this followed up with the practical calls of repentance, without which no orthodoxy can save him; the amplitude of the gospel invitations; and, in spite of all that has been so unintelligently said about our gloomy and relentless Calvinism, the wide & unexcepted amnesty that has been held forth to every creature under heaven, so as that the message of reconciliation may be made to circulate round the globe, and the overtures of mercy and good will from the mercy seat above be affectionately urged on all the individuals of all the families of earth below.—These are the main credenda of a Church that has oft been reproached for its hard and unfeeling theology—but, nevertheless, a theology which, deeply seated, as it still is, in the affection of our peasantry, hath approved itself by their virtues and their general habits, to be, after all, the fittest basis on which to sustain the moral worth and the moral energies of a nation."

THE LATE REV. SIR HENRY MONCREIFF WELLWOOD, BART. D. D.

We willingly lay before our readers, the character of the late Rev. Sir Henry Moncreiff Wellwood, Bart., as drawn by the master hand of Dr. Andrew Thomson, of St. George's, Edinburgh. The name of Sir Henry, as a Minister of our Church, stood so high, and was known so widely, that we forbear enlarging upon what is done so ably in the extract below. He began his ministerial career at an early age, as successor to his father in a Parish in the Presbytery of Perth—he was afterwards translated to St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, where he laboured as first Pastor to 40,000 people, beloved and revered by all, till he died

“The loss we have sustained, is indeed unspeakable. It has created a void in our community and in our attachments, which we can never hope to get supplied. He who has been taken from us, was not one of those ordinary men who may disappear from the stage of life, without being regretted beyond the circle of their private acquaintance, and whose places may be easily filled up from among the many equals whom they leave behind them. It is not even enough to say that he belonged to that more limited class, whose abilities, and education, and influence, have raised them above their brethren, and given them a superiority which few, comparatively, can ever expect to reach. He towered above us all, and held a station to which the least diffident and the most accomplished of us, felt ourselves constrained to look up with reverence. He stood forth among his contemporaries, confessedly pre-eminent in strength of personal and of social character. He occupied a place in our esteem, and confidence, and veneration, down to his very latest days, which nothing but singular and paramount worth could have enabled him either to acquire at first, or afterwards to maintain. And we may safely affirm, that among those who know how to appreciate what is truly great and good—who can distinguish between the superficial and solid in human attainment—who understand the real value of intellectual vigour, combined in its operations with lofty principle, virtuous sentiment, uncorrupt manners, and practical usefulness—there never was a man more highly and sincerely honoured while he lived, or more deeply and deservedly lamented when he died.

To give any suitable delineation of him, is a task to which I feel and confess my total inadequacy. I knew him well indeed; having been long privileged with his friendship, having enjoyed much personal intercourse with him for many years, and having been often honoured to “take counsel,” and co-operate with him in matters of interest and importance. But my very knowledge of him satisfies me that I cannot do justice to his memory. I cannot speak of him as his peculiar merits demand. I cannot speak of him as you will justly expect. I cannot speak of him as my own heart would fondly wish.

This, however, I regret the less, as his character, in all its leading aspects, must be so familiar to your own minds, and so strongly and distinctly impressed upon them, as to require from me no illustration to make you either know or understand it. It had a length and a breadth which made it obvious to all. It had nothing hidden, or disguised, or equivocal about it. It was bold, open, forthcoming—resembling, in that respect, his own outward person, which carried on it the impress of conscious integrity and bold independence, not only when he was in the prime and fulness of manhood, but even when his features had been softened, and his stature bowed down by age—so that you could not fail to be conversant with its reigning qualities, and its standard merits. There was a magnanimity in his modes of thinking and of acting, which was evident to the eye of observation, as were the lineaments of his face and the dignity of his gait. And, indeed, in the profound and endeared respect with which you have ever regarded him, and in the silent but deep-felt sorrow which at this moment fills your bosoms, there are ample proofs that you are no strangers to all that high excellence by which he was so conspicuously dignified and adorned.

His great and primary distinction, as you must be well aware, was a clear, profound, and powerful understanding—which spurned from it all the trifles and circumstantialities of any case on which it was employed, which apprehended speedily, and fastened closely on its essential merits, and on its different bearings, and which advanced to the decision it was to give with unhesitating promptitude and determined firmness. Questions by which ordinary minds would have been baffled or perplexed, soon yielded to that penetrating sagacity and acute discrimination, which he brought to bear upon them, and with which he forthwith examined and finally settled them. And uniting with the exercise of these faculties, that extensive knowledge, and that accumulated experience of which he was possessed, and which he applied with no less skill than accuracy, the conclusions at which he arrived, and the opinions which he formed, were both sound and impregnable.

His mental superiority was not allied to the excursions of imagination, or to the elegancies and refinements of mere taste. To these he made no pretensions, though he was neither indifferent to their charms, nor destitute of relish for their finest and most classical displays. His peculiar walk lay in those departments where solidity of reasoning and strength of judgment are required; and there he was equalled by few, and surpassed by none. Nothing which demanded the exercise of these powers, came amiss to him, or left his hands without being extricated from the difficulties, and redeemed from the errors in which it had been involved; and carried out, in the most judicious way, to the best possible result.

He chiefly delighted, however, and he chiefly excelled in putting forth his master intellect on things of real importance to mankind.

in the discussion of those subjects, in the management of those affairs—in the formation of those plans, which concern the substantial and permanent interests of men, either by affecting the conduct and the comfort of individuals, or by affecting the fortunes and the happiness of communities—it was in these that he found his congenial element, and in these that he exhibited his distinguished endowments. He was not satisfied with arranging schemes or forming opinions, however just and perfect they might be in their own nature, if they were to terminate in being mere matters of speculation. They were attractive in his eye, by being practically and certainly beneficial. Usefulness was to him their grand, if not their only recommendation. And in nothing did he exert or display more of his transcendent talents, than in the wisdom and efficiency of those means which he devised for promoting the private or the public prosperity at which he aimed.

And when to all this we add the operation of those religious and moral principles which he derived from the Bible, and under whose government and controul he placed the whole conduct of his understanding, we must have such an impression of the strength and influence of his intellectual character as to feel that, in losing him, we have lost one of the ablest, and wisest, and most powerful men whom Providence has ever raised up to enlighten our Country and our age.

It was in early life, that he began to take an active part in the government of our National Church. The principles of ecclesiastical polity which he adopted as soon as he entered on his public career, he adopted from full and firm conviction, and he maintained, and cherished, and avowed them to the very last. They were the very same principles for which our forefathers had contended so nobly, which they at length succeeded in establishing, and which they bequeathed as a sacred and blood-bought legacy to their descendants. But though that circumstance gave them a deep and solemn interest in his regard, he was attached to them on more rational and enlightened grounds. He viewed them as founded on the word of God—as essential to the rights and liberties of the Christian people—as identified with the prosperity of genuine religion, and with the real welfare and efficiency of the Establishment. And therefore he embraced every opportunity of inculcating and upholding them; resisted all the attempts that were made to discredit them in theory, or to violate them in practice; rejoiced when they obtained even a partial triumph over the opposition they had to encounter; and clung to them and struggled for them, long after they were borne down by a system of force and oppression, and when, instead of the numerous and determined host that fought by his side in happier times, few and feeble comparatively were those who seconded his manly efforts and held fast their own confidence. He lived to see a better spirit returning. This revival cheered and consoled him. Fervently did he long and pray for its continuance and its spread. Nor did he neglect

to employ his energies and his influence, in order to introduce Pastors who would give themselves conscientiously to their Master's work ; preaching to their flocks " the truth as it is in Jesus," " watching for souls as those that must give an account," and faithfully and fearlessly performing all the duties incumbent on them, both as Ministers and as Rulers in the Church of Christ.

The attendance of Ministers on our Ecclesiastical Courts, he always considered as a matter of essential moment. However faithful and laborious they might be in their parochial sphere, he regarded the Church judicatories as another sphere where they had important obligations to fulfil, and where they had opportunities, if not of securing right decisions, at least of preventing serious evils, and of bearing an open testimony to the maxims, and the doctrines, and the practices of a purer age. He himself gave an example in this respect, of the lessons which he taught to others ; for as long as his strength was equal to the task, he was found steadily at his post, assisting at the deliberations that were carried on, and doing what he could for the interests of Religion and of the Church. For engaging in the business and discussions that were introduced on those occasions, he was admirably fitted by his acquired talents, as well as by his natural gifts. Whatever was the subject of debate, or whatever was the nature of the cause at issue, he was prepared for throwing upon it, almost all the light it could receive, and for guiding it to a just and advantageous conclusion, by his correct acquaintance with the principles of our Ecclesiastical Constitution—his minute knowledge of the forms, and statutes, and decisions of the Church—his power of separating between the intrinsic and adventitious circumstances of any question that came under review, and his energetic application of all the varied resources of information and of skill which he brought into the field, and wielded with the hand of a master. And many of you, I doubt not, have often listened with delight to the lucid statement, the forcible argumentation, and the bold, fervid, masculine eloquence which, if it did not command the assent, and determine the judicial conduct of those to whom he addressed himself, gave them at least a strong, irresistible impression of his talent and his sincerity, and rendered it a difficult achievement for them to resist his measures, and to adopt their own.

When I think of these things—when I look back on the course which he thus so long and so splendidly pursued—when I reflect on the power and the rectitude of his doings as an Ecclesiastical Ruler—when I consider that his single object was to advance the cause of Christianity in our land, and to render our Church its blessing and its glory—when I remember how dear that object was to his heart, and how strenuously and mightily he wrought for its accomplishment—and when I think myself of the melancholy fact that he has been taken from us, and that we shall see his face, and hear his voice, and profit by his labours no more, I cannot help exclaiming as Elisha did,

when with amazement and sorrow he saw Elijah carried up into heaven, "My father, my father! the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof!"

But he was not a mere Churchman, important as was that relation, and admirably and usefully as he sustained it; he looked abroad upon society and upon the world, and took an interest in all the fortunes of his fellow men, and felt the obligations and the endearments of every tie by which man and man are bound together.

I must not venture into the domestic circle—sacred at this moment by the depth and freshness of its sorrow—and tell you how much he loved there, and how much he was beloved.

But I may speak of him as a friend; and how many can bear witness to me, when I say that his friendship was invaluable! It was warm—it was disinterested—it was liberal—it was active—it was unostentations—it was unwavering and constant. And they who enjoyed it, enjoyed a treasure; for there was both the willingness and the ability to give them the most substantial tokens of his favour and regard; and he imparted these without grudging and without upbraiding, even when they cost him many sacrifices, and when ingratitude was eventually all his recompence.

I may speak of him as animated by a patriot's spirit. He loved his Country. He gloried in its eminence and its privileges. He stood for its independence, and for the freedom of its people as a birth-right—as a jewel that has no compeer—as a possession that is beyond price. He longed for its better emancipation from ignorance—from misrule—from faction—from every thing in its laws, its habits, its circumstances, which tended to mar its prosperity, or to endanger its safety. He prayed from the heart that God might save the King, and bless the people, and make this Empire the seat of true Religion, sound learning, of genuine liberty, of virtue, and peace, and happiness. He felt an interest in every thing by which its welfare could be affected; and conceiving that neither his Christian vocation nor his ministerial office, made him an alien from any thing that could work his Country's weal or his Country's woe, he was bold to express his sentiments on all topics of public importance, and thus assisted the progress of just and liberal views among his fellow-citizens, by giving to them all the influence that could be legitimately derived from his enlightened understanding, and his exalted character.

I may speak of him as a man of enlarged philanthropy, who mourned for the darkness, and the degradation, and the sufferings of his species; who rejoiced in whatever was done to illuminate the nations and diffuse the blessings of intellectual culture, of moral purity, of Christian doctrine, of comfort and of peace; and whose ardent and delighted anticipations were continually looking forward to the period, when every offence would be taken away—when every yoke would be broken—when liberty would be proclaimed to the captive, and the oppressed would go free—when the sun of righteousness

would shine upon the dark places of the earth—when civilization and its attendant blessings would visit every barbarous clime—and when, instead of that unrighteous and cruel dominion which sin is still maintaining amidst the unreclaimed myriads of our fallen race, the God of mercy would be seen “taking to himself his great power,” and reigning with unresisted sway over a holy and a happy world.

I may speak of him as a Christian whose “faith stood not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.” Though no one could more readily or ably “give to them that asked it, a reason of the hope that was in him,” and though no one prized more than he did, the arguments and the evidences by which Christianity is proved to be a divine revelation, yet the only effect of these, under the teaching of the spirit, was to fortify him in that simple, humble, unwavering belief which he yielded, as the tribute of his inmost soul, to the testimony of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ. He had thoroughly studied for himself, the whole scheme of the Gospel, and from full and deliberate conviction, as well as from its experimental application to his own personal need, he threw himself, without pretension and without reserve, upon the atonement and righteousness of the Redeemer, as the only ground on which he could look for pardon, acceptance and eternal life; and the longer he lived, the more firmly did he rest on that as the great, exclusive, immoveable foundation of a sinner’s hope. The grand and leading view which he habitually took of the Gospel, was that of a dispensation of grace—of grace free and unconditional; and in this light, he regarded it, not as a matter of mere speculation or mere assent, but as that in which he was personally and necessarily concerned for his own comfort and his own salvation.

But he felt, at the same time, that while the whole plea of merit which the carnal mind is so apt to urge even before the Holy Majesty of Heaven, is utterly vain and unavailing, inconsistent with the dictates of conscience, and contradictory to the word of truth; and while he saw that unless he had recourse to the divine mercy, as manifested in the Gospel, and to that mercy alone, for every one blessing that his spiritual circumstances required, he could not obtain forgiveness and reconciliation: he felt, at the same time, that this doctrine generates and nourishes more effectually by far, than any thing else can do, that spirit of obedience to the will of God, without which, no redemption is experienced here, and no happiness can be enjoyed hereafter; and therefore he embraced the Gospel in its sanctifying power and governing authority, with no less docility than he embraced it in its message and in its offer, of a free salvation to the very “chief of sinners.” Accordingly, his belief and his conduct corresponded. He lived by the faith of the Son of God, and he abounded in godliness and good works. His practical Christianity, indeed, was cast in a somewhat different mould from that of many a sincere believer. It partook largely of the characteristic of his mind, whose

native energy and sound judgment prevented him from giving undue preponderance to any one department of the system, and led him, as if by instinct, to prefer the substantial to the showy—to husband his exertions in the cause of religion, so that they might not become feeble and fruitless, by being extravagantly multiplied—to exhibit the silent evidence of action, more than the noisy pomp of profession—and, if mercy and sacrifice presented each its claims on his regard, to “do the one, and not to leave the other undone.”

Those who knew him best, can best give witness how faithfully and habitually he imbodyed his knowledge, and his principles, and his hopes as a Christian, into his life and deportment, his daily walk and conversation—how tenderly he cared for the fatherless and the widow that were so often committed to his charge—how active and assiduous he was in helping forward deserving youth, in giving counsel and aid to the many who had recourse to him in their difficulties, and in doing good to all his brethren with unaffected kindness, as he had opportunity—how patient and resigned, amidst the severest bereavements, and of these he experienced not a few, with which Providence can visit the children of mortality—how fervent in his devotions and prayers—how diligent in his study of the sacred volume, from which he drew all his religious opinions—how correct and dignified in the whole of his personal demeanour—how engaging in the lighter play, as well as in the graver exercise of his social affections—and how ready amidst all the attainments he had made, and all the honour he received from men, to acknowledge, as I have often heard him do, the short comings of his duties, and the inadequacy of his services, and the sinfulness and imperfection that mingled in all his doings, and still to betake himself to the blood of sprinkling and the finished work of the Messiah, as all his refuge and as all his hope.

And when he came to die—too soon for us, but not too soon for himself—he manifested the same excellencies that had adorned him during his long and active life—the same piety towards God—the same trust in his blessed Redeemer—the same dependence upon the Spirit of all grace—the same fortitude under suffering—the same affection to his friends—the same anxiety about his people—the same desire to be useful to all within his reach, who needed his counsel or his aid. And to show how deeply he was imbued with the spirit of religion, and how much he had been habituated to devotional exercises, and how truly, amidst the cares and activities of a long public life, the concerns of the soul and eternity had been his all in all,—during the whole course of his last sickness, and even amidst the few and short-lived wanderings, occasioned by great bodily debility, of his once powerful mind, the whole strain of his meditations was directed towards his God and Saviour in heaven. I shall never forget the earnestness and the fervour with which, a few days before his death, and immediately after I had prayed with him, he poured forth these holy supplications for himself—“Lord sanctify me more and

more—fill me with all joy and peace in believing, that I may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost—guide me by thy counsel while I am here, and afterwards receive me into glory.”

I have still to speak of him as a Minister and Herald of the everlasting Gospel. He esteemed it his highest honour to be employed in proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation to perishing sinners—in delivering to them the message with which he was intrusted—and in “testifying to all the Gospel of his grace.” And though the greatest of human beings is not too great for such an office as this, and though the reality and the power of the Gospel depends not on the opinions of men, yet I have often regarded him with admiration and reverence, and have felt myself become stronger in the faith of a suffering Redeemer, when I saw a man of his vigorous intellect, of his varied experience, of his masculine character, and of his station and influence in society, ascending the pulpit which I now occupy, that he might “preach Christ and him crucified,” and that he might preach this humbling, offensive, and despised truth, as the truth of God, as the object of his own settled faith, and as the foundation of his own fixed and delighted hope. I need not tell *you*, my friends, of this congregation, how faithfully he “declared to you the whole counsel of God”—how ably and how clearly he opened up the Scriptures for your instruction—the force and distinctness with which he addressed your understandings—the unction and the fervour with which he appealed to your hearts—the anxiety which he displayed to alarm the careless and the impenitent—the tenderness which he showed in speaking consolation to the afflicted—the encouragement that he presented to the timid, the dejected, and the wavering—the reproofs which he sent home to the consciences of the backsliders—the seasonable admonitions which he gave to the young and to the old, to the rich and to the poor, to men of every rank and of every condition—the uncompromising fidelity, and the unaffected earnestness with which he testified to one and all of you, “repentance towards God, and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ,” with which he mingled the doctrines and the duties of the Christian life, as inseparable from one another, and with which, in all that he spoke to you, he exhorted, besought, and persuaded you “by the mercies” and “by the terrors of the Lord,” to “flee from the wrath to come,” and to “take hold on eternal life.” In this work of preaching the gospel, he had peculiar pleasure—his whole heart was in it—he always spoke of it with something like fondness—he performed it with great punctuality, even after the feebleness of advanced age had come upon him—and there is not one of the youngest and most diligent Ministers of our Church, who is more careful, more assiduous, more unremitting in making his pulpit preparations, than *he* was, down to the very last time that he conveyed to you his Master’s message. And one of the latest things that he said to me, indicated that he thought of this high office in all its importance, and that he thought

of it with delight, even when his ministry was closed for ever. When mentioning to him, on the communion Sabbath, that I had to leave him, in order that I might be in time to officiate for him here, he said, with all the ardour which he was capable of expressing, "I delight to preach—but I shall never preach there any more—I shall never speak a word to that people again." And then he added, with firmness, though with difficulty, "I could go over the whole earth to preach the doctrine of salvation by the cross of Christ."

Such, my friends, and far more than this, was the man of God, the minister of Christ, the pastor, the father, and the friend, whose departure we are this day lamenting, and will long have reason to lament with deep and unfeigned sorrow. Let it be our concern to profit as we ought by this sad dispensation. It reads many lessons of wisdom to all of us; let us humbly incline our hearts to learn these, and let us diligently set ourselves to practise them. Let the old take warning that their time is short, and let them "work the work of God while it is day, for the dark night is coming in which no man can work." Let the young notice the blessedness of them that live to the Lord and that die in the Lord, that it may be their ambition, living and dying, to be the Lord's. Let those of us who are put in charge with the ministry of the gospel, give heed to the counsels we have received, and to the example we have witnessed, and be animated in our labours as the servants of Christ, and as the servants of our people for Christ's sake, and think often of death and judgment, that we may be ready to give in our account "with joy, and not with grief." And let all of you who have been bereaved of an able and affectionate pastor, lay to heart the advantages you have enjoyed, and the responsibility you have incurred. You shall never again listen to his voice: but O! remember that, "though dead, he yet speaketh," and that the word which he thus continues to speak, is that word of God which he so long and so zealously enforced upon you for your salvation. Cherish fondly the memory of his worth, that the doctrines which he taught you, may, by this association, be the more precious in your regard. Treasure up every warning, every rebuke, every exhortation, every promise, every comfort which he addressed to you in the name of his great Master. Cultivate the character which he was so desirous to form in you as the character of them that believe in Jesus, and look for heaven. And "follow his faith"—the faith which he preached, and the faith which he exemplified—"considering the end of his conversation, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and for ever."

And let me once more offer you the consolation which the doctrine of my text affords. Your beloved pastor is sleeping in the dust, but he sleeps in Jesus, who is the resurrection and the life, and his flesh rests in hope, that though corruption be his portion in the grave, immortality will be his portion in heaven. And this glorious prospect was not only opened up and secured to *him*—it belongs to all

of us who, like him, have fled to the life-giving Saviour, and are interested in his "eternal redemption." We too, are hastening to the grave: and very soon these hearts, which are now melting into grief as they muse on the virtues of him who is away, shall beat no more; and these bodies with which we have come in solemn sadness to present ourselves as mourners before the author, both of life and of death, shall have "the worms of the earth to cover them," and be to this world as if they had never been. But if we be "children of God by faith in Jesus Christ," "though we be dead, yet shall we live: This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality—and death shall be swallowed up in victory. Where then, O! death, is thy sting? O! grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be unto God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." "Wherefore, comfort," yourselves, and comfort "one another, with these words."—And to him "who liveth, and was dead, and is alive for evermore," be all the praise!

ON THE USE AND ABUSE OF LITERARY AND ECCLESIASTICAL ENDOWMENTS.

(*By Thomas Chalmers, D. D. Professor of Moral Philosophy
in the University of St. Andrew's.*)

Learning is not like an article of ordinary merchandise, or at least, is not like to it in that only respect which would make endowments unnecessary. It is not true that, upon this artificial encouragement being withdrawn, there would remain an adequate encouragement in the native and spontaneous demand of the people for education. There is an utter dissimilarity between the mental appetite for knowledge, and the physical appetite for those necessities, or even those luxuries of life, which constitute the great materials of commerce. It is not with the desire of knowledge, as it is with the desire of food. Generally speaking, the more ignorant a man is, the more satisfied he is to remain so; but the more hungry a man is, the less satisfied he is to remain so. In the other case, the starvation of the mind is followed up by the agony of an intolerable desire after the food of the body, and to appease which any exertion or sacrifice will be made. There is no such appetite for knowledge, as will secure a spontaneous and originating movement towards it on the part of those who need to be instructed. There is such an appetite for food, as will secure a spontaneous and originating movement towards it, on the part of those who need to be subsisted. In the matter of education, the supply of the article cannot be confided to the operation of demand and supply; for there is not a sufficiently effective demand. There is an abundant guarantee in the laws and constitution of sentient nature for an effective demand in the matter of human subsistence.

It is this difference truly in the strength of the desire or the demand, which forms the real distinction between the two cases: so that, while an endowment may be necessary in the one, it may in the other be wholly uncalled for. Government does

not need to erect shops for the sale of the necessities of life, or to help out, by a salary to the dealers, that price which customers, rather than want the necessities, are willing to give for them. But Government may need to erect Schools, and to help out, by a salary to Teachers, that price which the people are not willing to give for education. It is because of the strength of the physical appetite, and because of the languor of the intellectual or the spiritual appetite, that the same political economy which is sound in matters of trade, is not sound in matters either of literary or christian instruction. This is a subject on which the people need to be met half way. The motion for their education will not be begun, or be made, in the first instance, by themselves. It must therefore be made for them by others. A people sunk in ignorance, will not emerge from it by any voluntary or self originated act of their own. In proportion to their want of knowledge, is their want of care for it. It is as necessary to create hunger amongst them, as it is to make the provision. They will not go in quest of scholarship. The article must be offered to them; and offered to them with such recommendations of a payment that is moderate, and a place that is patent and easily accessible, as may at least draw their notice, and call forth their demand for it.

* * * * *

There are five College classes of Natural Philosophy in Scotland; and, by a statute of apprenticeship in our Church, every aspirant to the ministry, must pass through one or the other of these, ere he can be admitted to his theological studies. We feel quite confident in affirming that, but for this statute, with salaries to professorships, there would not be enough of attendance from the whole land for securing a decent livelihood, even to one professor of the science. And this scarcity of pupils would be aggravated just in proportion to the pure, and lofty, and philosophic character of the course. If, for example, it were the transcendental aim of the professor to accomplish his students for the perusal of La Place's *Mechanique Celeste*, we doubt if all Scotland together would furnish him with so many as twelve, that would listen to his demonstrations. At this rate, it is obvious that no class should be formed, just because the proceeds of it could afford no adequate maintenance to a Teacher. This arduous and recondite philosophy behoved to disappear, simply by ceasing to be transmitted from one generation to another. The record of it, in unknown hieroglyphics, might still be found in our libraries; but it would have no place in the living intellect of our nation.

When a distinguished professor of this country hazarded the assertion, that there were not twelve British mathematicians who could read La Place's great work with any tolerable facility, we fear that, alive as the whole nation is to its honour in the field of war, or political rivalry, there are but few indeed, of the nation who felt the affront of being left so immeasurably behind, in this highest of all intellectual rivalry, both by France and Prussia. It is verily one of the worst symptoms of our degeneracy, that almost nowhere, in the most cultured society, is the expression of regret ever heard, because that glory which a Newton shed over our country, has now departed from us. Yet it is refreshing to observe in what quarter of the Island it was where the quickest sensibility was felt for the honour of British mathematics. It was in the academic bowers—the lettered retreats of Cambridge. *There* the somewhat precipitate charge of our northern collegian met with a resentment in which so few can sympathise; and *there* also, we rejoice to believe, that it met its best refutation. And, if in that wealthy seat of learning, even twenty individuals could be found to master the difficulties of the French analysis, this, in the midst of surrounding degradation and poverty, of itself speaks volumes for endowments.

[As examples of the eminent men who have flourished in our Universities, the learned Doctor appeals to the works of—]

Colin Maclaurin, and Robert Simson, and Matthew Stewart, and Wilson, of Glasgow; and Dr. Black, and Professor Robinson, and the Monros, and Gregories, and Cullen, of Edinburgh; and Hamilton, of Aberdeen, and Playfair, and

Leslie ; and in regard to moral and political science, we appeal to the writings of Hutcheson, and Adam Smith, and Reid, and Miller, and Campbell, and Beattie, and Dugald Stewart, and Tytler, and Fergusson, and Brown. We would further appropriate to the honour of our Universities, the publications of Principal Robertson in history, and Dr. Hill in theology, and Blair and Barron in taste and criticism, and Dr. John Hunter, of St. Andrew's, in classical learning, and the philosophy of grammar.

* * * * *

The radical error of our system, lies in the too early admittance of our youth to Universities. Generally speaking, whether we look to their age or to their acquisitions, they are too soon translated from the pedagogy of a School, to the more liberal discipline of a College. The change wanted (and on it every other desirable improvement could be easily suspended) is, that a far higher than their present average scholarship should be exacted from them, ere they are admissible as students. As it is, we pass a great deal too early from the treatment of them as boys, to the treatment of them as men. In the majority of cases, they take their departure from the grammar school, without even the first elements of Greek, and without being able to translate extemporaneously the easiest of our Latin authors. It would be well, we repeat, if, ere they could be received into a College, *for any professional* object, they had a far higher practical acquaintance with both languages ; and if, by their tried and ascertained expertness in the work of translation, they should evince both that they have a large command of vocables, and that they are thoroughly grounded in syntax and grammar. But, for this purpose, it seems absolutely indispensable that the period of their boyhood, with its appropriate drudgeries, should be considerably extended. They should be kept at least two or three years longer at drill ; whereas at present, they are handed over to the professor before the school-master has finished his work upon them ; and, by the existing method of our University tuition, the one is in the worst possible circumstances for executing what the other has left undone. All the vigour and vigilance that can possibly be put forth from the academic chair, never will replace the incessant task-work, the close and daily examinations, of the school-room. What should be done is, that ere the University course shall commence, the scholastic course, instead of being cut short, as it now is, should be allowed to attain its proper and adequate completion. It is assuredly in the rudimental part of education, that we are defective ; and it is in this, that we are so much excelled by our southern neighbours. We are weak throughout, because weak radically. A failure at the root, is sure to be indicated by a general sickliness—a lack of strength and stamina, even in spite of that gay and gorgeous efflorescence which disguises the frailty that is underneath. The characteristic freedom, exuberance, and activity of our College system, we hope, will remain unchecked and untrammelled ; but certain it is, that these would yield a produce far more enduring, were they grafted on the deep and well-laid foundation of English scholarship.

ENGLISH AND SCOTISH UNIVERSITIES.

Professor Sandford, the writer of the following letter, was a Student of Christ Church, Oxford. His father is the Episcopal Bishop of Edinburgh.

The reputation of Dr. Chalmers gives weight to his opinions upon any subject. It is with concern, therefore, that I find him hazarding some loose and inconsiderate remarks upon the system of Classic Education in the Northern Universities.

These remarks, as far as they militate against the fame of other Colleges, other pens may answer; I shall notice them only as they comprehend, within the range of general hostility, the character for Scholarship usually ascribed to the University of Glasgow.

Did Dr. Chalmers invite us to speculate on virgin ground—to imagine degrees of possible excellence in some Utopian Establishment—it might, perhaps, be easy to conceive something theoretically better than the best of existing institutions. But he refers to a much more tangible standard of comparison, by asserting, in peremptory terms, the superiority of Southern discipline. We “*are weak throughout, because weak radically;*” our neighbours “*have a deep and well laid foundation of Scholarship.*”

Knowing, probably, but little of the ordinary attainments of English youth, the mind which drew this humiliating contrast has, I doubt not, been dazzled by the conspicuous splendours of English maturity. Dr. Chalmers has gazed upon the vast achievements of Southern Scholarship without heeding to inquire whether any other cause may be assigned for these except a system of elementary instruction, of which he supposes the principles and practical details to leave Scottish ingenuity and labour panting far behind.

I shall, perhaps, be considered, with regard to experience, a competent judge of this question; and circumstances vouch for my impartiality; since, if professional vanity should incline to one side, strong hereditary feelings must speedily redress the balance. Thus judgment is left free to act; and, as a patriotic Scotchman, Dr. Chalmers will rejoice in my expression of convictions, which are the result of anxious observation, and the candid desire to form a correct opinion.

To my own department—the province in which the youth of Scotland are thought to be least familiar—I shall exclusively advert; and although, in point of age and length of application, the students quitting my Senior Class should be compared with those who emerge from the upper forms of an English public school, I am content to compare them with under-graduates of the English Universities about to pass their first examination, an event which occurs after a year and a half of residence, and when the candidates are usually of the age of 19 or upwards. Under this restriction, I affirm, without fear of being contradicted,

1. That, out of equal numbers, there will be found as many good Grecians in this College as in either of the Southern Universities.

2. That the good scholars here will be found to rival the good scholars of England in the easy and accurate translation of Greek authors; and, generally, to surpass them in the analysis of words, in the trying task of Greek composition, and in the critical and philosophic knowledge of the language.

If these assertions, however deliberately made, be still considered *mere assertions*, let me next appeal to *facts*. Small as the number is of students who leave these walls for the arena of the Southern Universities, not a year elapses that I do not hear of some distinction won by the members of this scanty band. And I might call upon the heads of Balliol College at Oxford to attest, whether the Scotch exhibitioners from this University do not yield far more than their due proportion of excellent scholars. Out of sixteen *first-class* honours, obtained by Balliol between the years 1810 and 1824, *six* were gained by Scotchmen, and *five* of these were Glasgow exhibitioners. The resident under-graduates of Balliol are about *sixty-two*, and of these the Glasgow exhibitioners average between *three* and *four* at any given period; so that, although forming only *one-twentieth* of the number of aspirants, they yet vindicate *one third* of the honours obtained.

But it may be objected that the gentlemen alluded to form the very flower of our students,—for that none repair to the Southern Colleges save those who are eminent for diligence and talent. On the contrary, for each good scholar that goes, I will produce six of equal merit that remain; and many who remain are superior to the majority of those who go.

How, then, does all this rich residuum evaporate? How is it that a large number of admirable scholars, at the usual term of quitting the Greek Class, produce so small a crop of classic eminence afterwards displayed?

The answer to these questions must be sought for in the circumstances and condition of the country. The cause lies far beyond the Academic walls. I flatly deny that there is any radical defect in the Collegiate system, or that, if "*vigour and vigilance*" be "*put forth from the Chair,*" they will be put forth without most excellent immediate results. But who is to foster the work thus happily begun? If Great Britain wish to see classic learning flourish in the North, let her revive the wise beneficence of Papal times. Let fellowships be founded, let endowments be erected, and Scotland will soon match her wealthy neighbour in the decorations of classic splendour. What has Scotland now? Take away three or four chairs in different Universities, and what of emolument or dignity does she offer to be attained by scholarship? Scotland has great poets, great historians, great philosophers, and great lawyers, because there are great revenues and honours to be gained by eminence under any of these characters; and she will have great men of learning, whenever the rare union of industry and genius requisite to form an accomplished scholar shall be sure to meet with adequate reverence and reward.

I should be ashamed to allude to topics so obvious, were they not so frequently overlooked; and were it not of importance, in this age of experiments, to show that some things may possibly *be well as they are*. Universities, above all, appear to be esteemed a sort of common-ground for speculation; and, for their supposed deficiencies, every quack has his *nostrum*. One proposes to protract the period of admission to the Scottish Colleges—forgetful that a complete revolution in the habits and sentiments of Scottish society must *precede*, not *follow*, such an alteration. Another would prolong the duration of the Session, not reflecting that two-thirds of the Students could not give a longer attendance: and that, therefore, for the sake of one third, the whole must suffer; since the energy of tuition must of course be relaxed in proportion to the extension of time.

As for Dr. Chalmers, I leave him to choose his horn in the following dilemma. Either he intended to include the University of Glasgow in his strictures, or he did not intend it. If he did not, he was bound, in common candour, to mark the exception while he pronounced the censure: if he did, he has reasoned concerning an important part of youthful education without becoming cautious, and has ventured to make very broad assertions without inquiry as to facts.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

D. K. SANDFORD.

College of Glasgow, Feb. 19, 1823.

SERMON TO THE 79TH REGIMENT, ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO.

We subjoin the following address to the Soldiers of the 79th Regiment, or Cameron Highlanders, being the concluding part of a Sermon delivered to them on Sunday the fifteenth of June, on the eve of the Anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo, by the Rev. H. Esson,

from Proverbs, chap. 16, v. 32. "He that is slow to anger, is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit, than he that taketh a City."

"Soldiers! to you the words of my text have a peculiar, and I may add, a pointed application. The sacred writer has, in the text, compared or contrasted the military glory of the hero and the conqueror, with the less specious and noisy—but more true, more solid and enduring reputation which crowns the soul of the man who exercises over himself, a strict moral government—who ruleth his spirit—who is the conqueror of his passions—whose ambition is to rise to virtue, as the only true greatness and glory of human nature—who aspires after the purest and highest excellence, that which is moral, spiritual, divine.—Do you feel all the ambition, all the pride which become the spirit and the honour of a Soldier, to adorn your profession—to maintain, and if possible, to increase your reputation, and to add to the martial renown of your country. If this is a feeling, as I doubt not it is, which lives and glows in the breasts of many of you, we honour and applaud it. Foster and cherish it. It is virtue so to do. But forget not, at the same time, we intreat you, that all the qualifications which form the Soldier, and constitute the honour and the distinction of your profession, like all that is really and essentially ennobling in life, will be found to consist in, or to result from that strict discipline of the mind—that perfect self command which my text has extolled as the consummation of human glory. "He that ruleth his spirit, is better than the mighty."

The base slave of his appetites and passions, the drunkard, the glutton, the voluptuary, inflicts as deep a stigma of ignorance on his character, not only as a man, but as a soldier, as if he were chargeable with cowardice. If patience, if hunger, if thirst, if pain, if weariness and watching, if these are (and such they have been esteemed in every age) the qualifications to form the soldier, do they not imply a strict, vigilant, uncompromising self-government, or absolute controul of the senses, appetites and passions? Is the spirit, the valour, the daring which lead you to encounter with fearless eye and soul the look of the foe which make you burn with impatient ardour to rush into the midst of peril and of slaughter—a more rare, necessary, or ennobling character of your profession—than the passive courage which, in the midst of cold, hunger, nakedness, fatigue, and every privation and hardship, impart to the soul not a sullen, stubborn, apathetic endurance, but a manly and high toned, a generous and heroic patience, the courage of the soul, a moral and christian fortitude, which rises as far above the courage of mere temperament, and animal spirits, as the soul is superior to the body which it animates and inspires. And if these are the rarest and noblest qualities that can enter into the character of the soldier—if without these mere boldness, adventure and daring, are little better than the fierceness of the savage or of the beast of prey—think how utterly incompatible they are with intemperance or excess of any kind—with gluttony, drunkenness and sensuality. Think how necessary, how essential even to your professional character, success and honour, is that discipline of virtue and religion, which my text recommends—a discipline of which that of the camp may be regarded as a striking and beautiful emblem or image. Order and subordination, a prompt and implicit submission to authority—a vigilant and unremitting attention to every duty—it is the end of military discipline to ensure and to enforce.

Like unto this, should be that moral and religious discipline which ye should severally strive to exercise over your own spirit, training all your senses, affections and passions to a prompt, implicit, unreserved obedience to reason and conscience.

* * * * *

We can sympathise, Soldiers! What heart is so ignoble, what spirit so rigid as not to sympathise with the gallantry which ye have displayed in many a bloody field, with the valour which has won you so many trophies, and placed your name high in the annals of military renown. We can sympathise with the proud and

glorious recollections which this season must recall to your memory—a season made memorable not only to you, but to your country and to the world—in which, among the foremost brave, ye bore your gallant and glorious part in closing the dreadful and lengthened drama of revolutionary wars and horrors which had filled Europe with desolation and ruin—which had convulsed and appalled the world—that day in which, under a mighty leader worthy of such soldiers, ye conquered the conqueror of Europe—became the saviours of your country—hurled from his usurped and unrighteous throne, the despot to whom all, save that land whose sons smote him to the dust, had bowed the knee in subjection or in servitude. We can warmly and deeply sympathise with the emotions of such of you as were present on that glorious day, when ye look back on the desperate and deadly conflict, on all its toils and horrors in which, while ye fought for your king and your country, every private soldier went into the battle as if they were suspended on his single sword, his single arm—bore in his breast the soul of the patriot and the hero, and one feeling pervaded, animated, united all hearts, in bands stronger than adamant, rivetting every Briton to his brother, and making them a wall of brass, an impregnable bulwark against no common, no vulgar enemy, whether we regard the number and the valour, and the discipline of the troops, or the pre-eminent genius and talents of their leader.

It seemed as if the genius of our country had, that day, quitted her own ancient loved Isle of the ocean, hovered over the battle-field's dreadful array, and canopied amidst the waving banners of our host, as if to enkindle all the soul of her sons, and to infuse into them a double portion of her own spirit. Every heart was steadfastly true to the sentiment which might be regarded, as by a sort of tacit compact of kindred and sympathising souls—the watchword of the day, glorious victory, or no less glorious death. Yet, Soldiers! all those recollections of martial prowess and martial pride, animating and conspiring as they are, cannot touch the heart so powerfully, or with such a delightful emotion, as another; and suffer me, without any disparagement, to add a purer and rarer glory which ye brought home with you to your native land; such of you as were privileged by the favour of heaven to return from the field which your valour had immortalised, it was the praise of gentle, humane, inoffensive manners and behaviour; it was that character, the noblest which a Soldier can bear; and the nobler, that it is not the part of ordinary virtue to resist the temptations to which the profession of arms exposes you, the character of moral worth, of a pure, sober, religious spirit, which, while it sheds a new and brilliant lustre on your deeds in war and in battle, is of itself sufficient to ennoble your name, and to endear you to your country. This gives to your military virtue, a lustre, a glory, of which, oh! be jealous, guard it with all the vigilance with which you would hold fast in your grasp, the banners of your Country. Let no stain be upon it. Be not only anxious to promote and preserve it in yourselves, but watch with a brother's, with a parent's eye, over your fellow soldiers and comrades in arms. Let one moral feeling reign among you, and as the honour and the glory of your regiment, be careful, as far as in you lies, that nothing in yourself or in others may detract from this highest praise, that, while ye are in the field the bravest of the brave, and rush like lions into the battle, ye are in peace gentle and harmless as doves. Maintain an unoffending spirit, a spotless purity of moral character. Let your souls be as pure and bright as the swords which ye wear, which are never drawn but in the service of your country, which are never stained save with the blood of her enemies.

Fear your God—honour your King—love and serve your Country—and to discipline and train your souls to all that is manly and excellent, to all that becomes you as men, as soldiers, as Britons, and as christians, let the words of my text be engraved on your hearts—“He that is slow to anger, is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit, than he that taketh a city.”

STATISTICS.

POPULATION OF NOVA SCOTIA FOR 1823.

FROM A CENSUS PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY IN HALIFAX.

COUNTY.	RELIGION.													BIRTHS. No. of in the County during the year ending 30th Sept.	MARRIAGES. No. of Fe- males in the County dur- ing the same period.	DEATHS. No. of in the County during the same period including Labourers.
	Methodists.	Baptists.	Lutherans.	Dissenters from the established Church of En- gland.	Ditto Ditto Scotland.	Universalists.	Sandinians.	Quakers.	Swedenborgi- ans.	Jews.	Antimouians.	Unitarians.	Doubtful or per- haps of no reli- gion.			
Peninsula of Halifax,	1164	680					23			3			21	384	520	1293
District of Do.,	150	688											32	370	157	
District of Colchester,	50	868										D	250	334	77	
District of Pictou,													7	501	115	
County of Hants,	1590	1753												330	362	
Do. Kings,	1080	4454												339	115	
Do. Annapolis,	1776	4872				21		14	3			4	10	435	100	
Do. Shelburne,	1501	4872	26	13		25		75						635	124	
Do. Queens,	1253	411	45	1231		9		60			9			150	77	
Do. Lunenburg,	844	1192	2397	3173				2						331	120	
Do. Cumberland,					405			7						240	49	
Do. Sydney,															89	
	9403	19790	2963	4417	405	55	23	158	3	3	9	4	320	4563	945	